

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2013

Members Present: Capi Wampler, Nan Chase, Jo Stephenson, Brian Cook, Patricia Cothran, J. Ray Elingburg, David Carpenter, Woodard Farmer, David Nutter, Sue G. Russell

Members Absent: Tracey Rizzo, Brendan Ross

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Jim Funk, Marilyn Funk, Daniel Smith, David Baker, Barbara Baker, Steven Sreb, Larry Merrill, Bonnie Gilbert, Jeremy McCowan, Chris Gilbert

Call to Order: Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Carpenter moves to adopt the June 12, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Nutter
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

None

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Bonnie and Christopher Gilbert
Subject Property: 18 Starnes Ave.
Hearing Date: July 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.32-1373
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She notes the applicant has submitted photographs of Montford properties showing windows in similar configurations, based on Commission comments from the preliminary review.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant lot at the corner of Starnes Ave. and Elizabeth Place. 1928 Sanborn maps show a 2-story home oriented towards Starnes Ave. previously located on the site.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 1,860 sq. ft. 1 1/2 story</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>home, per attached plans and specifications. Foundation of new structure will be stucco over concrete block. Siding will be horizontal fiber cement with 6 1/4" reveal on first story and cedar shingles above. Details include brackets, trim boards, corner boards, exposed rafter ends and window and door surrounds. MiraTec trim boards will have smooth side exposed. Roof will be gable style with 10/12 primary pitch and <i>weatherwood</i> asphalt shingle. Windows will be double hung, aluminum clad, SDL, three over one with some three light casements. Porch will have T & G flooring, tapered columns with <i>Hoopers Creek</i> stone base and 2'x 2' wood rails. Rear deck will be 10'x10' x 12' with no railings. Front walk will be stone. 24' x 18' gravel parking area will be located in the rear using existing curb cut. Landscaping per attached plans. 4' high post and wire fence per site plans to be located in the rear yard. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm that MiraTec trim will be smooth sided to match siding 2. Confirm configuration of stone piers <p>The guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of proposed new construction.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
Applicant(s)	<p>Bonnie Gilbert, property owner, shows material samples and a storyboard to the Commission and offers to answer questions. She introduces her contractor, Jeremy McGowan, who shows samples of the siding and trim.</p> <p>Ms. Merten asks Ms. Gilbert to explain the stone veneer treatment. Ms. Gilbert describes the proposed stone applications.</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter asks about the stone configuration for the front walkway, notes it seems to be cut out of a rectangle. Ms. Gilbert replies the path will be 4' wide, and the stones will have some fan treatment.</p> <p>Commissioner Cook asks which side of the siding will be used (smooth). Ms. Gilbert shows an example of stucco for the foundation. Commissioner Nutter asks if the corner steps will be maintained (Christopher Gilbert answers they plan to reuse the steps in their original location. He says the City is working on the sidewalk. Ms. Merten says things will be put back in place as part of that process.).</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Farmer says the windows in the front seem small for that period, noting the ones in the rear are larger than the front elevation. Ms. Gilbert says they could increase the size, and looks at the plans to determine how much. Commissioner Cook says the head heights should line up. Discussion follows on how best to make the front window on the left larger. Commissioner Russell suggests an additional window next to the planned one would also work, instead of enlarging the window. Ms. Gilbert says she will either make double windows at the current height, or a wider and larger window.

Commissioner Stephenson asks if one transom window on the rear elevation could have more detail. Ms. Gilbert says it could.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – eight photographs of existing lot, neighboring houses and street scenes; Exhibit C – photograph of existing curb cut for driveway off Elizabeth Place at back of lot; Exhibit D – two photographs showing fence examples; Exhibit E – five photographs of neighborhood homes showing window placement examples; Exhibit F – rear, right side, left side and front elevations; Exhibit G – upper and main floor plans; Exhibit H – basement and foundation plan; Exhibit I – site plan; Exhibit J – landscape plan; Exhibit K – site plan with aerial photograph; Exhibit L – storyboard; Exhibit M – board showing exterior light fixtures, exterior door style and paint colors; Exhibit N – foundation stucco sample; Exhibit O – pier stone sample; Exhibit P – weatherwood asphalt roof shingle sample; Exhibit Q – siding sample; Exhibit R – trim sample; Exhibit S – window specifications (*Exhibits L – S submitted 7/10/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of June, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 21st day of June, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits T and U.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct new 1,860 sq. ft. 1½ story home, per attached plans and specifications. Foundation of new structure will be stucco over concrete block. Siding will be horizontal fiber cement with 6 1/4” reveal on first story and cedar shingles above. Details include brackets, trim boards, corner boards, exposed rafter ends and window and door surrounds. MiraTec trim boards will have smooth side exposed. Roof will be gable style with 10/12 primary pitch and *weatherwood* asphalt shingle. Windows will be double hung, aluminum clad, SDL, three over one with some three light casements. Porch will have T & G flooring, tapered columns with *Hoopers Creek* stone base and 2”x 2” wood rails. Rear deck will be 10’ x 10” x 12’ with no railings. Front walk will be stone. 24’ x 18’ gravel parking area will be located in the rear using existing curb cut. Landscaping per attached plans. 4’ high post and wire fence per site plans to be located in the rear yard. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following conditions:

1. Revised plans should be submitted to staff showing header height on right window to match front door and left window size increased (or another window added).
2. Revised plans should be submitted to staff showing mullions added to transom window on rear elevation.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Larry E. Merrill
Subject Property: 62 Cumberland Circle
Hearing Date: July 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-04-5874
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Early 20th century 2-story shingled-sided Colonial Revival dwelling. Pedimented entrance supported on Doric columns, stone piers, flanking porches. Before 1917. The Sanborn maps indicate that the roof was of a non-combustible material in 1928.</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 115 sq. ft. frame storage building with gable style roof to mach main house. Structure will have lapped wood siding and shingles in gables. Shed will be painted Cape Cod red to match the main house. The entrance door will be a 4' 8" x 7' barn type door on rollers. Window will be 6 over 6 double hung. Reroof house and cottage with 29 gauge standing seam metal (insert specifications) metal in <i>medium bronze</i> color. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Windows on storage building should not be vinyl. 2. Roofs on accessory building should be compatible with the main building. 3. New metal roofing should be compatible with the historic residential nature of the district. <p>The guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 and guidelines for Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The metal roof is dark in color and compatible with the historic character of the district. 2. The accessory building is inconspicuously located in the rear yard and is compatible with the style of the main structure.
Applicant(s)	Larry Merrill, property owner, gives the history of the 1908 house. He describes the reasons he thinks it should have a metal roof. He shows specifications for the roof he wants to use, and photographs of other metal roofs in the neighborhood.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	Daniel Smith, contractor, says the coating of metal roofs is a primary concern. He describes ceramic coating, noting its energy saving features are much greater than pre-painted metal. He suggests the Commission consider regulating colors of metal roofs, saying browns and grays fit better into the historical district.

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioner Farmer asks Mr. Merrill why he chose the "Classic" option from his supplier, noting this is a misleading term. Mr. Merrill says he may have been swayed by the historic sounding name, and is willing to consider other options. Commissioner Farmer describes the differences in available metal roofs, and shows photographs of examples he thinks look historic, and non-desirable treatments. He presents specification sheets showing standing seam options, and points out the differences in widths and capping methods.</p> <p>Commissioners discuss standing seam variables and note wider spacing is preferable, 18" to 24", and the height of the ridge caps should not exceed 1', in order to look historic. It is agreed 'snow</p>

ridges' are unacceptable. Ms. Merten says standing seam has been specified for metal roof CAs, and sometimes 5v, but what has transpired has not always been a good match for the historic district.

Mr. Merrill asks to amend his application to a 5v crimp, 24" to 36" wide, in dark bronze color.

Ms. Merten asks Mr. Merrill to explain why he wants asphalt shingles on the new shed instead of metal. He says the shed will blend better with structures on neighboring properties and it will be closer to them.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – aerial view of property showing proposed storage building; Exhibit D – twenty photographs with legend showing existing property and vicinity; Exhibit E – detail drawing of proposed storage building; Exhibit F – photograph of door and window examples; Exhibit G – specifications for shingles, building and roof materials; Exhibit H – roof examples including six photographs, three pages of specifications and two pages of colors (*submitted 7/10/13*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of June, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 21st day of June, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits I and J.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct new 115 sq. ft. frame storage building with gable style roof to match main house. Structure will have lapped wood siding and shingles in gables. Shed will be painted Cape Cod red to match the main house, shed roof will be asphalt shingle in dark color to match surrounding structures. The entrance door will be a 4' 8" x 7' barn type door on rollers. Window will be 6 over 6 double hung. Reroof house and cottage with 29 gauge 5v crimp metal, 36" width, in dark bronze color. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 and guidelines for Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The metal roof is dark in color and compatible with the historic character of the district.
 - b. The accessory building is inconspicuously located in the rear yard and is compatible with the style of the main structure, and surrounding storage buildings.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of

Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following condition:

1. Window on new storage building be aluminum clad.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: David and Barbara Baker
Subject Property: 48 Soco Street
Hearing Date: July 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.03-6846
Zoning District: RS-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She notes the roof on this house is not very visible from the street, and metal is compatible in this case even though it may not have been the original material. She notes one of the goals of the revised guidelines is to be more green-friendly, and metal is more sustainable.</p> <p>Property Description: Late 19th early 20th century 2-story vernacular stucco dwelling. Multiple gables with shingles. Before 1917. The Sanborn maps indicate a composite material in 1928.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Remove existing shingles and install new 5-v 9 (insert specifications) metal roof in <i>Koko brown</i>. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The new roof material should be compatible with the historic character of the house and the district.2. A sample profile of the roof should be submitted to staff for review.
-----------------------	---

	<p>The guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Reasons: The metal roof is dark in color and compatible with the historic character of the house and the district.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Daniel Smith, contractor, submits a color sample. He shows a panel of 5v that is different from the 5v previously discussed. It has ridges in the panels; he says this makes the roof more rigid. Commissioner Farmer and Ms. Merten note a smooth panel between the ridges is more historic.</p> <p>Commissioner Cook and Mr. Smith discuss the installation of the roofing material, where screws are and are not visible in the different types.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Farmer and Ms. Merten note a smooth panel between the ridges is more historic.

Commissioner Cook and Mr. Smith discuss the installation of the roofing material, where screws are and are not visible in the different types.

Ms. Merten says she will need a profile sample.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – two photographs showing roof view from the street; Exhibit C – three photographs of neighborhood houses with metal roofs; Exhibit D – roof design, color and material specifications, Exhibit E – four photographs of example roof; Exhibit F – roof material sample; Exhibit G – proposed 5v profile specification (*submitted 7/10/13*); Exhibit H – revised 5v crimp profile (*submitted 7/10/13*); Exhibit I – roof examples including six photographs, three pages of specifications and two pages of colors (*submitted 7/10/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of June, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 21st day of June, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits J and K.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. That the application is to remove existing shingles and install new 5-v crimp metal roof 24" wide with flat spaces between the ribs in *Koko brown*. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The metal roof is dark in color and compatible with the historic character of the house and the district.
 - b. The roof is not highly visible from the street and is not a character defining feature.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following condition:

1. Roof panel be reviewed by staff.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Steve Sreb
Subject Property: 101 Santee Street
Hearing Date: July 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.85-6109
Zoning District: RS-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Existing non-contributing ranch style dwelling built in 1969.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Demolish existing structure due to severe termite damage. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>None</p> <p>The guidelines for Demolition found on pages 60-61 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure is non-contributing in the historic district. 2. The structure is severely termite damaged.
Applicant(s)	Steve Sreb, property owner, offers to answer questions.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners see no problem with the request.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – three photographs of existing structure; Exhibit C – survey showing existing structure; Exhibit D – termite report; Exhibit E – site plan showing footprints of proposed minor subdivision structures; Exhibit F – three drawings of possible designs for new structures; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Elingburg;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of June, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 21st day of June, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits G and H.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to demolish existing structure due to severe termite damage. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Demolition found on pages 60-61 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The structure is non-contributing in the historic district.
 - b. The structure is severely termite damaged.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: James and Marilyn Funk
Subject Property: 75 Magnolia Ave.
Hearing Date: July 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-5343
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides and explains work on a rear porch has already taken place without a CA, there were safety issues involved. She has asked the applicants to submit details about the work at this meeting. She says the applicants have also asked for a wooden fence in the front yard due to a drop off adjacent to the house. She notes wooden fences were not traditional in front yards in Montford, but the neighborhood asked they be allowed in certain conditions in the revised guidelines. The applicants have changed the style of the proposed fence and she believes the new picket style fence is in keeping with architectural style of the house and is appropriate in this case, being a small lot on a small side street with other existing wooden fences on the street. She notes the roof is not very visible from the front of the building, and thus metal would be acceptable. Atty. Ashley asks if Sanborn maps indicate the original material, Ms. Merten answers they indicate a composition roof.</p> <p>Commissioner Nutter asks how the applicant intends to enclose the 2nd story porch. Ms. Merten says they are proposing windows, and they will submit specifications at the meeting. She notes the guidelines specifically</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>state that front porches should not be enclosed. Commissioner Nutter notes the porch is already enclosed with the metal mesh. Ms. Merten says a previous wrong treatment does not qualify as justification for a new wrong treatment. She says the existing treatment can be kept, and is grandfathered unless there is a request for removal.</p> <p>Ms. Merten reports she has received a letter from a neighbor who could not attend the meeting, who is concerned about the porch being enclosed. Atty. Ashley says this should be considered by the Commission, but it shouldn't have as much weight as what is presented at the meeting.</p> <p>Property Description: Early 20th century 2-story vernacular gable end dwelling. Shingle sided with shingled porch posts. Recessed porches. Before 1917. The Sanborn maps indicate a two-story front porch, a 1 story rear porch and composite roofing material in 1928. The 2nd story porch openings have been screened and covered with a metal mesh.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: 1) Remove original shingle style balustrade on east side of rear porch and enclose with cedar shingles and remove plywood infill on north side of rear porch and cover with cedar shingles to match the rest of the house. 2) Replace existing roof with standing seam metal (insert specifications) in <i>Evergreen</i> color. 3) Enclose 2nd floor room/porch with casement (insert window information) windows. 4) Remove existing chain link fence and replace with picket fence painted white, to be located at property line per site plan. 5) Remove two cedar trees in front yard and replace with two small maturing trees.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Staff has asked the applicant to bring information to the meeting concerning the rear porch work which was previously completed, an alternative fence design and drawing as well as window specifications of front porch enclosure.2. Enclosure of front porches is not allowed.3. New roof should be compatible with historic character of the dwelling. <p>The guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 and Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff understands that the applicant is working to rehabilitate a home that has been severely neglected, but the enclosure of a front porch is explicitly prohibited in the guidelines. Staff is also concerned about the treatment of the rear porch pending further information. Staff recommends approval of the other aspects of the application.</p> <p>Reasons:</p>
--	---

	<p>? The home is on a small lot on a side street and there are other wooden fences currently existing on the street. A wooden picket style fence is compatible with the character of the home.</p> <p>? The trees are very close to the house and have outgrown their original space.</p> <p>? The new roof will be compatible with the historic character of the home.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Homeowner Jim Funk compliments and thanks the Commission for their hard work, says he completed some restorations in Charleston and knows the process. He says he and his wife Marilyn are only asking for minor changes to this house, and they understand every house is significant in Montford. He says they want to improve the property and the neighborhood, and be good neighbors. He says he has studied the guidelines and thinks they are really well done. He reads from the guidelines about the goals of the HRC building a collaborative relationship with property owners, and interprets this as providing some flexibility. He reads from page 11 in the guidelines about balancing the need to alter a historic property in order to meet changing uses while retaining the property's historic character. He says they seek to work collaboratively with the HRC, while meeting their own needs and desires. He says their goal is to improve sustainability, while reducing the energy footprint. He notes they are doing a rehabilitation, not a restoration, and notes the house has been described as vernacular by Ms. Merten, it is not one of the prized architectural houses of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Mr. Funk says the structure has been compromised by previous owners, noting replaced vinyl windows on the second floors and a steel front door. He says it still has good structure, and they intend to keep and use as many existing materials as possible, including the cedar shake siding, the tongue and groove flooring, beaded ceilings, and they hope to restore the wood windows on the first floor. He says they intend to paint the cedar shake siding a grayish green that will go with the proposed roof color. He says their primary drivers for the metal roof are energy efficiency, fire safety, and storm resistance. He notes he is proposing a traditional standing seam roof that is very sustainable, and will have a lifespan three times longer than an asphalt roof. It will have a Class A fire rated assembly, better storm impact, and has a baked-on Energy Star finish.</p> <p>Mr. Funk says he does not think the 2nd story area in question is a front porch. He says it is a 2nd floor area designed like a sleeping room off of a bedroom. He says the metal grates have compromised the appearance of the house. He describes the storied history of the house, and speculates the grates were part of an attempt to keep people in or out of the house. He describes the windows they want to use, and how they reflect the original windows on the first floor. He says they will not change the openings and will be compatible in size and mass. He thinks this would be a tremendous improvement, and the insulated glass would greatly increase the energy efficiency. He says they have flexibility for this change through the Asheville Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8, which describes HRC, saying</p>

	<p>nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a property owner from making any use of his property not prohibited by any other statutes, ordinances or regulations. He says a heated space on an existing foundation is an appropriate use. He agrees the guidelines say a front porch should not be enclosed, but this area has already been enclosed and they want to improve it. He says the inside of the room will retain all of the existing original materials.</p> <p>Mr. Funk describes their plan for removing the chain link fencing and installing something more compatible with the neighborhood. He shows photos of other wooden fences nearby. He talks about the cedar trees that have grown past their intended use. Ms. Merten recommends they be removed. Mr. Funk says they would like to replace them with dogwoods or Japanese maples.</p> <p>He shows photos of the back of the house, and explains what was done to remedy the safety concerns. He points out how the shingles were installed in a flared fashion at the corners, to duplicate the original style. He says the new work will be painted when the rest of the house is painted.</p> <p>Commissioner Chase asks if it will be a single family residence (<i>yes</i>), the square footage (1700 SF), and the size of the porch (approx. 240 SF).</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks for reasons the fencing couldn't be metal, post and wire, and located on the sides of the house. Ms. Merten says the applicant can ask for a wood fence in a front yard, if it is reviewed as a major work.</p> <p>Commissioner Cook asks Mr. Funk how he would describe the 2nd level area. Mr. Funk replies the guidelines refer to sleeping porches and balconies, and he thinks a front porch includes an entry and is on the 1st floor. He sees they space as already enclosed, and says his family needs the space to be heated for family use. Commissioner Cook says regardless of whether it is a sleeping porch or balcony, if it wasn't enclosed it should remain that way in order to retain and preserve the original character of the house. He says this would alter the look of the house significantly. Mr. Funk argues the metal grates have already altered the look, and says they won't be changing the other features of the porch. Commissioner Cook makes an analogy to houses in Charleston with porches on the side that have been enclosed and have significantly lost their character, referencing that Mr. Funk is from the Charleston area. He thinks enclosing this porch would have a similar impact to the front façade. Mr. Funk responds he believes the metal grates have already done this. Commissioner Chase doesn't think the metal grates are very visible, but the proposed windows would be.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks if screening would be allowed if the mesh was removed. Commissioner Cook says historically screening would not have been a feature, Ms. Merten agrees. Mr. Funk says the City ordinance gives them the right to use the space in the way they choose. Atty. Ashley says if an HRC guideline conflicts with another part of the UDO, the HRC ruling</p>
--	--

	<p>trumps. For example, under normal zoning codes a certain setback may be required, but HRC may choose not to use that setback if it is not historically compatible. Also, there is a provision that if one ruling is more stringent, that is the one that applies, and in this case the HRC's are more stringent. Ms. Merten says preventing the enclosure of this porch does not prevent the use of the house as a residential structure.</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter wonders if there is flexibility in the guidelines for enclosing porches. Ms. Merten notes there is flexibility for side or rear porches or balconies, but #9 on page 73 specifically says "Enclosing a front porch is not allowed."</p> <p>Commissioner Cook says adding windows would significantly alter the look of that space, going from empty to solid. Commissioner Stephenson notes enclosing it in any way would also open it up to further alteration. She notes the way it was built shows it was intended to be open, the way the exterior shingles wrap around to the inside of the porch. Enclosing would really alter the front façade.</p> <p>Atty. Ashley asks if there is any way to document that the porch was ever enclosed. Ms. Merten says Sanborn maps show the area as a porch, which would indicate it was not enclosed. Atty. Ashley notes some sleeping porches are enclosed on the rear of structures in Montford. Ms. Merten adds that some may also have been enclosed before the guidelines were implemented.</p> <p>Commissioners discuss the after-the-fact rear porch work, noting an area has been enclosed there. Ms. Merten asks Mr. Funk if he reused the window that was there (yes). Ms. Merten says that the rear porch was previously enclosed and a window was reused for the repair work. Since this is in the back there is more leniency per the guidelines.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer does not think the proposed fence is appropriate. Ms. Merten thinks it is acceptable because it will not be on a main street, there is a small street frontage and there are neighboring properties with similar fences. She notes this is an area the neighborhood asked for compromise in certain cases, and she thinks this fits those cases. Chair Wampler asks if height is regulated, Ms. Merten replies not more than 4' and less than 65% solid.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer says the standing seam proposed is too narrow at 16", it could be 18". Mr. Funk says this is the available product from the company he plans to use, Best Metals. He notes there will be low-profile caps, and no striations.</p>
--	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

6:30 Commissioner Chase requests a five-minute break.

6:35 *Meeting resumes.*

Atty. Ashley explains options for the applicant if it looks likely certain provisions may not be approved, to avoid the entire application being denied.

Mr. Funk requests Item #3 be split from the application, and voted on separately.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan with proposed fence location; Exhibit C – eleven photographs showing existing conditions; Exhibit D – specifications for standing seam roof; Exhibit E – two pages of Pella casement window specifications; Exhibit F – drawing of proposed fence; Exhibit G – paint color sample; Exhibit H – photograph of proposed fence style; Exhibit I – five photographs of rear porch alterations; Exhibit J – letter of comment from Kenneth Jones, neighbor; Exhibit K – roof color sample; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of June, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 21st day of June, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits L and M.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to 1) Remove original shingle style balustrade on east side of rear porch and enclose with cedar shingles; remove plywood infill on north side of rear porch and cover with cedar shingles to match the rest of the house and reuse existing window. 2) Replace existing roof with standing seam metal 16” with 1” cap as specified in *Evergreen* color. 3) Enclose 2nd floor room/porch with casement windows. 4) Remove existing chain link fence and replace with picket fence painted white, to be located at property line per site plan. 5) Remove two cedar trees in front yard and replace with two small maturing trees. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 and Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guide lines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.

5.1 Items 1, 2, 4 and 5

This part of the application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

- a. The home is on a small lot on a side street and there are other wooden fences currently existing on the street. A wooden picket style fence is compatible with the character of the home.
- b. The trees are very close to the house and have outgrown their original space.
- c. The new roof will be compatible with the historic character of the home, and the bulk of the roof is not visible from the street.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Stephenson

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

5.2 Item #3 – Enclosing 2nd story porch

This part of the application **does not** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

- a. Guideline #1 on page 73 states, “Retain and preserve historic porches . . .”
- b. Guideline #8 on page 73 states, “Enclosing of a front porch is not allowed.”

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are not** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Stephenson

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **denied**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Farmer

Vote for: ALL

Preliminary Review:

None

Other Business:

Update on CLG grant for Preservation Plan. Ms. Merten reports the matching money for the grant was raised and the acceptance of the grant funds will be on the City Council agenda on July 23. Commissioner Nutter has offered to be on the committee to choose the consultant, a RFP will be issued later in the summer. Christy Edwards, a City Planner, will be assisting with the grant process. Commissioner Nutter suggests WNCHA submit a letter of support, Ms. Merten does not think it will be needed at this time, perhaps it would be more valuable later.

Discussion of Montford Guidelines. Ms. Merten says the committee met and Commissioner Stephenson took Hillary Cole's place on the committee. She says there are minimal changes that will be presented at the next meeting. She asks if more specific language regarding metal roofs should also be added to a guidelines revision (*consensus is yes*). She asks the Commissioners to submit any typographical errors that may need correction before the guidelines are reprinted.

Discussion of Killian house on Beaverdam Road. Ms. Merten says there will be a public meeting on July 18 at 6:30 at Jones Elementary about a proposed dog park that may impact a c.1842 Carpenter Gothic style historic house, the Wally Killian home on Beaverdam Road. It is facing possible demolition. The City Council has supported the dog park project, but now they are asking for further information regarding the significance of the structure. There are also environmental concerns. The house is not currently on the National Register, but SHPO is trying to gain entry to the interior to assess the status. Commissioner Carpenter notes a dog park does not necessarily mean the house needs to go down. Commissioner Cothran adds the Killian family is significant in Methodist history, as Bishop Asbury visited with them in Beaverdam. Ms. Merten says the SHPO is conducting research about the history of the property.

Commissioner Nutter moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 7:01 pm.